BT
695
C74
V.1
#3

The CREATIONIST

IS EVOLUTION A DEMONSTRATED FACT?

CASE FOR CREATION 4004 B.C.

THE EVIDENCE OF EMBRYOLOGY

Why a Christian Cannot Be an Evolutionist

What About Evolution?

What are the Oldest and Youngest Fossils?

LIBRARY
JAN 15 1968
Univ. of Tenn.

Volume 1 - No. 3 - September 1963 - 30¢

Is Evolution a

CONSIDERABLE attention was focused upon the year 1959 because it marked the passing of a century since the publication of Charles Darwin's famous book *Origin of Species*. Two years before the centennial, commemorative articles and books began to appear, authored by evolutionists and filled with praise for the man who popularized the idea of organic evolution. The tempo of eulogy of Darwin and of the idea of the development of complexity from simplicity increased through 1958 and into 1959 and finally burst into a great paean of praise at the Darwin Centennial Celebration, held November 24-28 on the campus of the University of Chicago.

Things went smoothly at the celebration because all forty-seven panelists had been carefully selected to make sure that each was an evolutionist, heart and soul. Scientists were present from all around the world. The roll included such names as E. A. Anderson, Sir Charles Darwin, Th. Dobzhansky, E. B. Ford, Sir Julian Huxley, L. S. B. Leakey, Ernst Mayr, H. J. Muller, Bernard Rensch, Harlow Shapley, G. G. Simpson, G. L. Stebbins, Sewall Wright, and on and on. How many believers in special creation sat with the 2,000 in the galleries I do not know, but I do know that at least one was present. Of course, no one opposed to the idea of evolution was given opportunity to speak. So it was the evolutionist's day, and the great evolutionistic steam roller rumbled and tooted and passed on, presumably having completely flattened all opposing views.

To express it mildly, it was a fascinating thing to sit and behold learned and supposedly conservative scientists so completely sold out to the hypothesis of evolution as to declare it *a demonstrated fact*. In the lofty words of anthropologist Sol Tax, the general chairman, "Knowledgeable people do not consider that there is any alternative to evolution." At the opening of the centennial Dr. Tax asserted, "For the first time evolution will be taken out of the category of 'theory.' Because of the centennial, evolution may be . . . accepted as a fact by the average layman." Astronomer Harlow Shapley was so carried away with the mysterious spirit of the occasion that he declared evolution to be a fact as well demonstrated as the fact that we live on a round earth. None of his panelist associates took public exception to his sweeping assertion.

Throughout the celebration, during the discussion of such topics as "The Origin of Life," "The Evolution of

By Frank Lewis Marsh, Ph.D.

Science Research Division, Andrews University

THE CREATIONIST Vol. 1 No. 3 30¢ per copy
Published by Christian Evidence League, Box 173, Malverne, N.Y. 11565 C. Wm. Anderson, Editor

Demonstrated Fact?

Life," "Man as an Organism," "The Evolution of Mind," and so on, no allusion was made to any need of a supernatural power. Natural forces were considered completely adequate for the production and maintenance of all things we see and experience in our world today. During the discussion of the origin of life, panel chairman Harlow Shapley polled his eight panel members for "Yes" or "No" on the question, "Do you think that living substance will be produced in the test tube in the next 100 years?" With the exception of Sir Charles Darwin, all panel members answered "Yes." Sir Charles asked for and was granted the privilege of passing the question.

It is a very disturbing thing to witness the confusion of renowned scientists on the point of the demonstration of evolution. Dr. Shapley was entirely correct in asserting that the spherical shape of our earth is a demonstrated fact. The items of evidence in the proof here are so obviously true as to require that we accept a spherical shape. There is just no alternative explanation, so we say that the proof is coercive. But to assert that the evidences for evolution are also coercive is to display confusion of mind. Actually the supposed proof for evolution consists wholly of isolated bits of *circumstantial* evidence. The similarity of the bones of different types of vertebrates, for example, is said to *prove* their common ancestry. But does not the same evidence indicate one Creator of basic types? In other words, there is nothing coercive in quality in these phenomena in the area of comparative anatomy.

Again the evolutionist points out the demonstrable fact that quite dissimilar organisms carry many genes in common, as indicated by the occurrence of similar enzymes and similar biochemical processes, and we are told that this is *proof* that if the phylogeny (race history) of these organisms could be traced back far enough a common ancestor would be found. But it is important to observe that the presence of similar chemical substances and biological processes is again evidence for one Creator of basic types. Here, as in morphology, all the evidence in the area of comparative physiology and genetics is not in the least coercive. The occurrence of similar bones in diverse basic types can be demonstrated, and the occurrence of similar enzymes and biological processes in diverse types also can be demonstrated, but that is where empirical science ends. To say that these phenomena *demonstrate evolution* is to admit confusion of mind, because evidence which can be explained in at least two ways is not coercive and hence can demonstrate nothing.

As we study the evidences which are presented for evolution from not only comparative anatomy and comparative physiology and genetics but also from biogeography, taxonomy, and paleontology, we find the very same situation exists throughout. *Every item* of evidence produced is *always* merely *circumstantial*, and because of that quality it can be interpreted from at least two points of view. Not one item is coercive in quality so that it can indicate only

evolution or only special creation. At the Darwin Centennial Celebration we were told that all this circumstantial evidence *has* to mean evolution. Would a million items of circumstantial evidence *prove* special creation? No. Neither do they *prove* evolution.

Evidence of this sort is also described as *persuasive* evidence. The name is well fitted, because if a person is already persuaded that evolution has occurred, then all items of circumstantial evidence seem to him to *demonstrate* evolution. The same is true for the Bible believer who accepts special creation of basic types. Sitting with the 2,000 in the galleries and hearing repeatedly the inaccurate declaration that evolution was a demonstrated fact, I felt ill as I realized how few of the listeners were alert to the untruth that was being foisted upon them. Probably most of those in attendance left that hall convinced of evolution and have everywhere proclaimed to receptive listeners that evolution of basic types is now a *demonstrated* fact. Most regrettable is the fact that in 1960 we live in a day when mankind is just as fatally in the grip of authority as were the Europeans during the oft decried Dark Ages. The broken-spirited and subjugated cry of *"Maestro dixit!"* (the teacher speaks) still echoes dismally in our own free land.

Interestingly, during the Dark Ages a reverse situation existed—the believers in a type of special creation were in the majority and made life miserable for those who held to any other belief. In those days an extreme type of fixity of species was taught in the universities which held that God had created each species of plant and animal and set it down on the earth in the very spot where that organism was found. This doctrine was a confusion of Genesis and Aristotelian philosophy. This impossibly extreme view of origins was still being taught at Cambridge when Darwin was graduated from the theology course there in 1831, and continued to prevail even at the time of the publication of *Origin of Species* in 1859.

In commenting on this situation Reinhold Niebuhr, sterling professor of theology and Christian ethics at Yale Divinity School, remarks, "The religious attitude was so stubborn because Christianity had for years compounded Aristotelianism with the Bible doctrine of creation. Of the two it was the Aristotelian science of fixed forms and species which seemed to be the most formidable opponent, particularly since many scientists challenged Darwinism for Aristotelian reasons. But in the minds of the pious the chief reason for challenging Darwin's conclusions was that they compromised both the majesty of the Creator and the dignity of the creature who had been said to have been formed 'In His image:' that is the dignity of man."—*A Book That Shook the World* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958), p. 31.

On page 41 of this same book Oliver L. Reiser, professor of philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, says, "Thus through the prevailing influence of Aristotelianism, the idea of 'fixity' of species was embedded in the formal structure of Western thought."

The importance, to our present consideration, of this narrow concept of the fixity of species lies in the fact that Charles Darwin understood that the Genesis reference to a creation of organisms "after their kind" meant this very type of fixity. Naturally, when on his world voyage Darwin saw, as would any other keen observer, that, instead of demonstrating such fixity, organisms actually gave every indication of having migrated over the earth, varying somewhat as they traveled, he immediately saw the sharp conflict be-

tween what could be seen and what he understood Genesis said.

It is obvious that Darwin was a very poor student of Genesis, because not only did he fail to see that creation of basic types could provide for great variation of organisms within certain well-established boundaries, but he also seems completely to have missed the record of the universal Noachian Flood. What Darwin saw in nature—the migration of plants and animals over the earth, varying as they went—was exactly what was to be expected if the basic types or kinds had been created and then at a later date, with the exception of samples of land forms which were preserved in an ark, quite completely destroyed by one terrific, universal Flood. The migrating plants and animals which Darwin traced were in the very act of traveling out from various points of Flood survival, or, in the case of land animals, of spreading out over the earth's surface from the mountains of Ararat. (See Genesis 8: 4.)

But for some strange reason Darwin failed to see the harmony between Genesis and observable facts, and after years of confusion over the problem he finally remarked in a letter to his botanist friend William Jackson Hooker in 1844, "I have read heaps of agricultural and horticultural books and have never ceased collecting facts. At last gleams of truth have come, and I am almost convinced (quite contrary to the opinion I started with) that species are not (it is like confessing a murder) immutable."

The great misfortune for mankind lies in the fact that when Charles Darwin in his confusion failed to see the harmony between what he thought Genesis said and what he saw in nature, and laid the Bible aside as unreliable, he set an example which thoughtless millions have followed. And they have suffered immeasurable loss through a refusal to recognize and accept God's divinely inspired Guidebook for them.

Darwin's service to science was his proclamation of the fact of variation among living things. However, keen observer though Darwin was, he missed the extremely important fact that *variation does not proceed indefinitely in a straight line*. After many years of close scrutiny of the effects of all processes of change in plants and animals, informed biologists tell us that these processes cannot be shown to produce anything basically new. Of course their faith in evolution leads them to believe that if given enough time these known processes, principally mutation, would accomplish evolution of new basic types. As Harlow Shapley expressed it at the Darwin Centennial Celebration, "In two billion years the impossible becomes 'mentable' (imaginatively possible)."

Facing the impossibility of proof of evolution among living things, biologists refer us to the fossil record for the will-o'-the-wisp of evolutionary demonstration. But the latest we have from that area comes from Norman D. Newell, curator of historical geology and fossil invertebrates, American Museum of National History, and professor of geology, Columbia University. Here are his words: "These isolated discoveries [of forms assumed to be connecting links], of course, stimulate hope that more complete records will be found and other gaps closed. These finds are, however, rare; and experience shows that the gaps which separate the highest categories (phyla, classes, orders, and superfamilies) may never be bridged in the fossil record. Many of the discontinuities tend to be more emphasized with increased collecting."—*Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 103,

No. 2, April 23, 1959, p. 267.

In plain language, the natural record of both the living and the dead is that living forms merely vary *within* clearly marked boundaries of the basic types. They never produce anything basically new. The fossil record testifies that this has always been the case. To the embarrassment of evolution, we recognize that this organization in nature is exactly what we would expect if the basic types were created after their kinds and then continued to bring forth after their kinds. How can scientists say that evolution is a demonstrated fact? By interpreting circumstantial evidence in such a way as to favor the origin they wish to accept.

In a world pervaded by a god of deceit, the great I AM knew that man would need a Guidebook to make certain vital facts clear. The evolutionist in his confusion volubly may claim kinship with the slimy, scaly, and hairy brutes, a kinship for which the Scriptures portray no future hope; but the Bible-believing Christian rejoices in the clear and harmonious testimony of the Written Word and the book of nature that all mankind are the children of Adam, who was created from the dust to be a son of God. (Genesis 2:7; Luke 3:38.) ★★★

THESE TIMES, SEPTEMBER 1, 1960

Problems and Methods in Geology by George McCready Price. Studies in Stratigraphic Geology, Methodology in Historical Geology, and The New Deluvialism in relation to evolution, creation and the deluge. **$1.00**

EVOLUTION, CREATION, AND SCIENCE
Frank Lewis Marsh

A discussion of the theories of evolution and special creation in the light of scientific facts. The author, listed in the latest edition of *American Men of Science,* is fitted through specialized training and original research to make a worth-while presentation of this vital subject. His theses on a definition of the theory of special creation which is in harmony with facts, the origin of modern species, the function of hybridization in the development of varieties of plants and animals, and the nature of proof for evolution are particularly profitable.

Price ..... ~~$3.50~~ 3.75

Studies in Creationism

by Frank L. Marsh

In this book Dr. Marsh discusses such questions as the following: When were the raw materials of our earth created? Were the days of creation week only twenty-four hours long? Did they begin with morning or evening? What is the significance of the expression "after his kind"?

Timely and arresting questions, with satisfactory answers by the author.

Cloth $3.75

Genes, Genesis, and Evolution

By John W. Klotz. A penetrating, full-length inquiry into man's origin. Will help those who hold the Bible to be absolute truth but are baffled by scientific claims. Excellent for classroom use.

575 pages, ~~$6.00~~ 6.95

Darwin, Evolution, and Creation

By Zimmerman-Klotz-Rusch-Surburg. A team of scientists and theologians critically evaluates the issues raised by conflict between Bible teachings and Darwinian theory.

231 pages, $1.95.

3.95

THE TRANSFORMIST ILLUSION ~~$3.50~~

By Douglas Dewar. A new concrete, scientific discussion of evolutionary theory. If you want a completely scientific denunciation of evolutionary doctrine by one who deals with it at its source, using its own documents and terminology, this is it.

DARWIN: BEFORE AND AFTER

By Robert E. D. Clark

The story of Evolution based upon investigation of original sources; What motivated the 19th Century Darwinians; how Evolution triumphed; what Darwin accomplished; and where Evolution stands today. 192 pages.

~~$2.95~~

1.00

The Case for
Creation 4,004 B.C.
A Challenge to Debate

By Dudley Joseph Whitney
Exeter, California

(Continued from page 31)

THE ISSUE OF DELUGE VERSUS GEOLOGIC AGE

What the geologists have been teaching for more than a century, as if it were unquestioned fact, is that the lands came into their present condition through geologic processes operating through a long series of geologic ages much as at present. Half a century before that they had accepted the Noachian Deluge as a key factor in the world's history; then they began to favor a combination of deluges and ages, but at last it was all ages and no deluge at all. The thesis here is that it was all Noachian Deluge (after creation) and no series of ages.

When the geologists adopted the theory of ages they had certain beliefs which they thought sustained their theory. They believed that the earth evolved into being as the Nebular Hypothesis had it, and it seemed reasonable to give it an evolutionary history after an origin by evolution. However, the Nebular Hypothesis, after being "good science" for a century was found to be bad science once it was studied carefully, and now no intelligent man believes it.

The early geologists believed that the sediments and the fossils therein were laid down by gradual processes, not by flood action. That was found to be wrong, as will soon be pointed out and they also believed that there had been a definite sequence in the order that different kinds of fossils had been laid down. The theory was that for millions of years there was no life on the earth; then there was an age of Invertebrates, then an Age of Fishes, but no land vegetation to speak of until near the end of that Age; then came an age of Amphibians and Coal Plants, followed by the Age of Reptiles and the Age of Mammals, which culminated in the present Age of Man.

They believed that when sediments and fossils of two or more of these supposed ages existed in the same earth column, the older would be under the younger—a very logical supposition. However, hardly had the theory of ages been adopted until instances were found where the sequence of fossils was the exact reverse of what the theory demanded, which was

plain evidence that the theory was wrong, or bad science; and similar instances have multiplied since then.

Of necessity they believed that the earth was millions of years old. It would have to be old to give time enough for these ages, but unassailable evidence has multiplied to show that the earth cannot be old.

These matters will be taken up in order, the first being the problem of

THE CREATION OF THE EARTH

In strict logic it can be said that no absolute proof of the creation of the earth can be given even though it was created. However, practical common sense demands belief in creation provided all theories for its evolutionary origin fail, and they do fail. And now for evidence to this effect.

The Nebular Hypothesis was one of the greatest generalizations in the history of science and one of the most important in its effect. It not only turned scholars to belief in the evolutionary history of the earth, but it finally convinced them that the operations of what we call Nature are purely *natural,* taking place because of the nature of matter and not because of any divine control of matter. It can also be said that during all the time that the Nebular Hypothesis was believed scientists would have seen its grevious faults if they had only studied it carefully and with an open mind. Its influence has been devastating.

The Planetesimal Hypothesis, which temporarily succeeded in favor the Nebular Hypothesis, was so faulty that no intelligent man would dare to defend it now. Essentially the same thing can be said of the Tidal Theory which followed the Planetesimal Hypothesis.

The condition at present is that astronomers have turned to the idea that the sun and the planets came into being by the contraction of dust and other particles spread out through space so great that it would take light from 30 to 100 years to cross it. Various men have different theories how this might come about. The most popular of these seems to be the Dust Cloud Hypothesis of Fred L. Whipple of Harvard University.

Possibly the best simple comment on this is to say that if a rotating nebula such as the original Nebular Hypothesis postulated would not contract into the solar system, surely dust and other small particles spread haphazard through an immense amount of space would not do so. At all events, if a man is to uphold the old earth-geologic ages theory, he should first get the earth into existence otherwise than by creation, and no one can do this.

For detailed objections to the Dust Cloud Theory the following statements can be made. First, it seems absurd to suppose that intensely cold matter in intensely cold space would become intensely hot after it came together through untold millions of years. Heat developed by the collision of particles with a central mass would be largely radiated away by the time a mass as great as the sun had formed

The earth is intensely hot within, as is seen by the temperature of molten lava and volcanic gases, also the material of the earth seems to have been sorted by heat—to the extent that 'natural processes' helped make the earth—and if the earth started far distant from the sun (as is believed in this Dust Cloud Theory) in intensely cold space, it seems unbelievable that it ever could become as hot as it is inside.

Next, and in connection with the above, it is significant that sulphur is one of the abundant elements of the earth. Assuming, as is commonly done, that the stony part of the earth has approximately the composition of stony meteorites, the crust of the earth should be composed of about one part sulphur to 55 parts common stony material, and since sulphur is easily vaporized by heat, sulphur now should be more abundant than water at the surface of the globe, if the earth once was very hot. More will be said on this in connection with the age of the earth. The geologists should straighten out this difficulty before they even begin to defend the old earth theory.

The almost circular orbits of the planets around the sun would seemingly not occur naturally, or by evolution. If they came from afar, as the Dust Cloud Theory has it, it would seem impossible that the sun could capture them in the first place, and if it did capture them, their orbits would be like the orbits of comets with long periods—near the sun at one end of the orbit and far distant at the other end.

Also, if the planets came from afar, they evidently came as a group, not at different times and at various angles, since they travel in the same general direction and in approximately the same plane. But if they came as a group, they almost certainly came at about the same speeds and would have about the same speeds now. Instead, they have very different speeds; the nearer the sun, the faster they travel; and the more distant from the sun the slower they travel. Thus the earth travels around the sun little more than half as fast as Mercury, but five times as fast as Neptune. Surely Mercury, the earth and Neptune never came to the sun as a group.

On the other hand, if the material of the planets shot out from the sun, as the discredited Planetesimal Hypothesis had it, it would seem inevitable that their orbits would be like those of long period comets, near the sun at one time and far distant from it later. The more distant planets, like Uranus, Neptune and Pluto, particularly would not attain circular orbits if they came from material shot out from the sun.

The evidence is as direct as it well could be that the earth came by creation, not evolution, and as a matter of fact, if it came by creation, any scholar is weak in both science, logic and philosophy if he insists upon an evolutionary history of the earth and a purely naturalistic explanation of the way the earth came to be as it is and in the operation of what we call natural processes.

And this brings us to the problem of

THE CREATION OF PLANTS, ANIMALS AND MAN

Scientists are helpless in their efforts to decide how the earth and the rest of the solar system could possibly have evolved into being, and surely this indicates the need of creation for the earth. Their efforts to account for the origin of plants, animals and man otherwise than by creation are equally futile, and this is the subject for our study now.

Let biologists argue, if they will, that after plants and animals came into being, variation and natural selection might cause some transformation of species to occur; nevertheless creation was a necessity to start things and this so-called evolution would only be change after creation.

Think also of the folly of assuming that the eye could, or would, evolve in some simple sightless animal so as to produce seeing fish, or squid, or insect, or other seeing animal! Think of the absurdity of believing that wings could start naturally on the back of some crawling creature, to make it become a flying insect!

The time factor enters the picture here in case any person has any hesitation about deciding between evolution and creation. Not many years ago 60 million years was the standard estimate for the age of the earth, and 30 million years supposedly had passed before animals were far enough along to leave fossils. Among the most advanced animals then—assuming the geologic ages—were trilobites, crustaceans of about the same level of organization as shrimps or lobsters. This left only about 30 million years to evolve fishes, amphibians, reptiles, primitive mammals and the higher mammals (in that order), from worms or other lowly creatures and all that time had passed except three million years before there were higher mammals known than shrews. From shrews such animals as horses, elephants, whales, bats, monkeys and man would have to evolve. A prize winning silly question would be, could they do this? A prize winning silly answer would be, they could. The only sensible answer is, they could not and did not.

To see the problem in some detail consider two types of animals, bats and whales. Take your choice which would be the more difficult; evolving bats from shrews, or whales from shrews. Here we will consider the shrew-whale problem.

Shrews might—or could they?—evolve into swimming animals like minks and otters. If this took place, it would surely take lots of time and we would still be far from having whales. Then mink or otter, or perhaps water shrew itself, would have to evolve into seal or sea cow as an half way station toward whale, and seal or sea cow would have to evolve into generalized whale and that into whale species which differ as much from one another as oxen from wolves.

Decide whether this could occur, no matter how much time was available for it; then decide how much time was available, then decide whether it could take place, without miracle or divine control of matter, on an earth where shrews were the highest known mammals three million years ago. Also highly specialized whales lived on earth, by ages geology, only a short time, as geologists figure time, after shrews appeared in the

fossil record. Fossils of the zeuglodon, an eel-shaped whale, are abundant in Eocene sediments of the Gulf states of the southeastern U. S., and the Eocene is the first great period of the so-called Age of Mammals. (Osborn in the Origin and Evolution of Life). Surely little time was available for its evolution from shrews.

There should be no occasion to write now on the problem of the creation or evolution of plants, animals and man. Evolutionists never did more than trifle with the basic problems of organic evolution; all they did was to discuss change after creation, as if that had more than trivial importance, and they did not get very far even there.

If any champion of the old earth theory will attack the proposition of Creation 4,004 B. C., he should give some good reasons for believing in real organic evolution and for denying the logic of belief in the creation of plants, animals and man. And this allows us to get back to the very critical question of the kind of history the earth had after evolution:

Mr. Whitney will continue this in the next issue of THE CREATIONIST with a discussion of *Deluge Geology vs Ages Geology* and *The Glacial Nightmare and the Deluge.*

***How Did the Earth Originate?** by D. J. Whitney. The nature and history of creation. **15c**

***How Old Is the Earth?** by D. J. Whitney. The Time Problem in relation to creation and evolution, presenting the evidence for a "young" earth. **15c**

***The Noachian Deluge: Key to the Earth's History** by D. J. Whitney. The case for the flood concisely presented. **25c**

***The Animals and the Ark,** or the Problem of Life, by D. J. Whitney. **15c**

***The Cause of the Deluge and Related Problems** by D. J. Whitney. Natural Processes in the Earth's History. **15c**

DID YOU MISS THESE?

Case For Creation 4004 B.C.

Amazing Credulity of the Evolutionist

Two Men Named Charles

Origin of Nations

Christian Manifesto Concerning Evolution

You missed them all if you missed CREATIONIST No. 1. Order one now 30¢

Genesis Versus Evolution

By D. J. Whitney

The Problem of Creation and Atheistic Science ~~$2.00~~.

Exposition of Genesis

By H. C. Leupold

1,220 pages. This volume, written by the professor of Old Testament Theology in the Lutheran Seminary, Columbus, Ohio, is a praiseworthy effort toward furnishing the English-reading Bible student a book of Genesis that will not disappoint. Although the author's comments are based on the original language, a knowledge of Hebrew is not required for a profitable use of this volume. The standpoint of the author is conservative. All critical questions are pointed out and answered. **$7.00**

***Feet of Clay: The Unscientific Nonsense of Historical Geology** by George McCready Price. A summation of the author's case against the geological ages. **25c**

***Were the Fossils Contemporary?** by George McCready Price. The Critical Time-element in the discussion of Evolution, Geology, and the Bible, the result of the author's unabbreviated experience of more than forty years of Geological Research. **25c**

The Evidence

THE evolutionist points to the similarity between classification and embryonic development as proof of his theory. On the other hand, he claims that creationists believe that this similarity is due to "the fancy of the Creator," and has no natural reason for being. Are these claims true or false? If they are true, then creationism must give way to evolution. If they are false, then creationism may hold its place as a scientific viewpoint.

To understand the question, we must notice the scheme of classification. The easiest way to do this will be to place the animal groups in order and to notice their characteristic features. We need not notice all features, but only those that have a bearing on the question under discussion. The table below gives the pertinent data:

Protozoa—single-celled animals.

Porifera (sponges)—hollow tube, simple.

Coelenterata (hydroids, jellyfishes)—hollow tube, complex.

Platyhelminthes (flatworms)—simple worm type.

Nemathelminthes (roundworms)—complex worm type.

Annelida (earthworms)—advanced worm type.

Echinodermata (starfishes) — advanced tube type.

Mollusca (snails, clams)—complex, modified worm type.

Arthropoda (crabs, insects)—complex, advanced, modified worm type.

Chordata (vertebrates)—fish type, with many advanced, complex modifications.

So much for the classification. What about embryonic development? It is commonly claimed that the embryos of higher animals and man go through stages that repeat the scheme of classification and, supposedly, the historical line of evolutionary ascent. Man, they say, passes through the following stages:

1. Single-celled stage, such as a simple protozoan.
2. *Morula,* or solid-ball stage, like certain colonial protozoans.
3. *Blastula,* or hollow-ball stage, like certain other protozoans.
4. *Gastrula,* or hollow-tube stage, like coelenterates.
5. *Neurula,* or wormlike stage.
6. Fish stage.
7. Reptile stage.
8. Simple mammal stage.
9. Fully recognizable human stage.

Are these claims true? Yes, absolutely! There is no reason to deny such obvious facts as these, for every student of embryology knows that they are true. But do these facts prove evolution? That is another question entirely.

Suppose you were creating a large series of animals. Would you arrange them in systematic order, or haphazardly? Obviously, in order. Does order, then, prove origin of one from another? Certainly not, for it might fully as well represent the systematic order of creation. Is this, then, the mere whim of the Creator? Not at all, for whim, or caprice, is indefinite, uncertain, and not in any regular order. The order that we observe in classification is of itself what we should expect to find in a world made by an all-wise Creator. There is, therefore, no reason for saying that such order proves evolution, for it certainly does nothing of the sort; at least, not so long as it could as well represent an orderly plan in the mind of the Creator.

# of Embryology

Do Similarities of Structure Prove Caprice or Wisdom?—Evolutionary Sequence or One Divine Architect?

Does Man Have "Gill Slits" in His Throat?

by HAROLD W. CLARK

Up to this point our answer to the evolutionist's claim has been a mere negation. Now let us turn the question about, and show him the other side.

Embryology does not reveal a uniform series of changes in animal development such as would be expected on the evolutionary theory. Instead, it shows many distinct types of development, each with definite adaptive relationships. Let us notice some of these.

One of the lowest of all chordate animals, the amphioxus, or lancelet, begins with a small egg which has no yolk. Because of its small size, this egg splits completely, forming a hollow ball (blastula). Then the cells on the upper side of the ball grow so rapidly as to overgrow the others, and force them up inside the hollow. This step forms the hollow-tube stage (gastrula). Next the gastrula elongates, passing to the fish form, where it remains.

A frog develops differently from the amphioxus. Its egg has a large amount of yolk, so it cannot split clear through. Cleavage forms a mass of cells on the upper side, which overgrow the yolk and eventually surround it. But the so-called "gastrula" of the frog is not a hollow tube like that of the amphioxus. It is a form peculiar to the frog and its relatives, showing no possible sequential development from the lower type.

Reptiles and birds have large eggs, whose yolk fills so much of the egg that cleavage cannot follow even the modified form of the frog. A thin superficial disc (blastoderm) is formed on one side of the yolk, and from this the embryo grows.

In mammals the egg is small, like that of the amphioxus. But they do not follow in any way the plan of the lower animal. Instead, the mammal has an entirely distinctive mode of its own, peculiarly fitted to a rapid development of the chorion and placenta. These structures are provisions for attaching the embryo to the body of the mother and supplying it with nourishment during its development.

This is not the whole of the story. Different mammals varv in details. In the invertebrates there are many variations. The insect egg, although simple, does not go through typical blastula and gastrula stages, but forms a superficial layer all over the yolk. There seems to be an endless number of types—a situation that is possible only on the assumption of a planned scheme. No mechanical system based on blind chance would produce so many variations.

Whim of the Creator? No! Not whim, or fancy, having no meaning. Rather, design, plan, infinite wisdom.

But, the evolutionist says, man has gill slits in his throat at one stage of his development.

No more absurd or unscientific statement was ever made, yet hundreds of textbooks repeat it year after year.

What are the facts of the case?

In all vertebrate embryos, the throat region is thrown into folds. These folds develop into the various cartilages of the jaws and larynx, and into glands and ducts of the throat. While it is true that in fishes and amphibia, gills develop on these folds, it is equally true that in reptiles, birds, and mammals no gills ever develop at any stage. To call the pharyngeal folds "gill slits" in these groups is merely a deference paid to the evolutionary theory. Unless this theory be accepted, there is no reason for using the term "gill slits" for these structures in reptiles, birds, and mammals.

Taking the general view of the whole question of embryonic growth, what do the similarities in different animals mean? In the first place, let us point out that such resemblances are extremely superficial. The "worm stage" of the higher animal is not a worm. The "fish stage" is not a fish. While there may be superficial resemblances, every embryologist knows that there are inner, deep-rooted differences that are so striking that all one has to do is to watch the process of development to find out to which type the embryo belongs.

Finally, we need to recognize that there is in the living world an abundance of evidence of intelligent design and planning. Similarities in structure may be interpreted to mean the action of a divine Architect and not necessarily to imply evolutionary sequence. The Ford series of cars follows a certain design, the Chrysler another, and the General Motors still another, because different engineers have designed them. Why might not the presence of certain similarities in nature indicate planning on the part of one great mind, the Creator of all things?

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, when scientists were so eagerly grasping the evolutionary explanation of embryonic relationships, one great scholar stood out against the popular trend. This was Oskar Hertwig, one of the world's greatest anatomists. In his *Cell and Tissue* he declared that the world had gone astray and had forgotten the real truth in this field. The truth was, he declared, that animals pass through certain similar stages because of fundamental laws of development. After all, the truth is so simple that we can easily overlook it. Let us keep in mind the fact that there are laws of development, and that these laws would of necessity cause a certain similarity of structure and growth in various creatures. There is neither necessity nor reason for the evolutionary theory in the field of embryology.

SIGNS of the TIMES
for MARCH 21, 1950

THE TWILIGHT OF EVOLUTION

by HENRY M. MORRIS

It is the contention of the author that evolution is declining in status with men whose presuppositions are Bible-centered. He points to a sizeable reservoir of intelligent anti-evolutionary Christian conviction in this and other countries. Among those who have not been sold on the evolutionary theory are scientists and geologists of status. Among these is the author himself.

Dr. Morris states that it is not too difficult to demonstrate that the entire concept of evolution is not only anti-Biblical but also unscientific. This the author undertakes to do in the pages of this book. This he does in a masterful fashion. The reader finishes his reading of this book with the conviction that the evidence for the theory of evolution is not nearly as formidable as is generally thought or contended.

2.95
paper 1.50 ~~$2.50~~

Why a Christian Cannot Be an Evolutionist

By Rev. James M. Gray, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

A Bible Conference Address

LET me say at once that this address is not conceived in any spirit of antagonism to earnest and sincere seekers after truth in the realm of nature. I stand in awe at the accomplishments of the men of science and the results of the abstract thinking of the philosophers of all the ages. I am not here to raise a laugh at the evolutionist, far from it, but to point out where he is wrong, seriously and dangerously wrong, that is, from the point of view of a Christian man, a man who believes the Bible to be the Word of God and who believes Christianity to be a religion revealed by God.

But first let us get our definitions right. Let us understand what evolution means and then what Christianity means.

I

What Evolution Means

There are many people who call themselves evolutionists who do not know what it means. They are ashamed to be thought ignorant, or behind the times, or out of fashion, and, therefore, they catch at the word as something that will exalt them in popular esteem. They would be horrified at their classification of themselves as evolutionists, if they knew what it meant.

What then, does it mean? What *is* evolution? Some people go no further than the primary definition in the dictionary in order to find out. They read there that evolution is the "act or process of evolving or working out a thing," and they say, "Why we believe that! Does not every one believe that?" Certainly he does, but that does not make him an evolutionist.

What the Evolutionist Says

Evolution, in the philosophic or scientific meaning of the term, is a theory which undertakes to account for, or to explain, the origin and course of the universe independently of God, independently of a personal creator, director and upholder of the universe. "Evolution is the teaching that the universe has come into being without the interference of any agency external to itself." So says E. D. Cope, an evolutionist. "The idea which underlies evolution is that species have had a natural rather than a supernatural origin." So says W. H. Conn, another evolutionist. "The universe is altogether non-miraculous as to its origin and progress." So says E. H. Haeckel, a third evolutionist. "The universe has been developed by the processes of nature." So says Lyman Abbott, a fourth evolutionist. These, observe, are the definitions of evolutionists themselves, who of course, know what they mean.

And yet, strange to say, evolution always starts *with* something, it always begins with matter, or substance of some kind, as *already in existence*. Where did the matter come from, how did it get into existence? The evolutionist does not know and does not pretend to say. He may tell you, merely, that it is an attribute of ultimate being. Or, he may say that an uncaused cause brought it into being, but he will go no further, because it is impossible to go further.

How He Reasons It Out

And this is the way the evolutionist argues or reasons it out. He says in some infinitely remote past, millions of years ago perhaps, matter and force appeared. Notice the word *force*. Matter without force, or substance without energy, would get nowhere and do nothing. Force is as necessary to be predicated at the beginning as matter is necessary to be predicated.

Now within this matter, says the evolutionist and associated with this force, there appeared an original cell. Ask him what he means by a "cell," and he will tell you that it is the smallest conceivable element of an organized body. Ask him what he means by an "organized body," and he will tell you an independent living activity, a body containing a spark of life. Ask him how that spark of life got into that body and he will tell you that he does not know!

But the evolutionist keeps on guessing.

He tells us that from this cell, this smallest conceivable element of an organized body, all things emerged. Ask him *how* they emerged, and he will tell you that they emerged by certain laws resident within that cell or that body. But laws commonly suppose a lawgiver; how did those laws get within that body? He does not know and he does not pretend to say.

Where They All Agree

There is one point however, of which the evolutionist is very sure, one point on which all evolutionists are agreed. That point is this, that there are no *gaps*, no breaks in the process of evolution. It is a chain without any missing link. There is a steady and continuous ascent from the lower to the higher forms of life, from the simple to the complex. From the primordial cell just spoken of, to the planets in the sky, and, in the organic world, to man himself. All these things are accounted for, says the evolutionist, by forces and laws operating *without a break*, remember that, from the original cell. All society has been evolved this way, so has religion, morals, politics and the mechanical inventions. They all come without a break, in continuous evolution from that cell. They were all worked out without any superintending agency whatever, without God, that is to say, from that cell. It belongs to the very essence of the theory to revolt against any claim for the interposition of creative power. The word *creation* as commonly understood, finds no place in the vocabulary of evolution.

Charles Darwin's Admission

But some one may call a halt at this point. He may ask if this is entirely fair to the evolutionist. He may ask if there are not some evolutionists who have a place for God. Are there not some who admit that God created matter and force, and placed them under those laws which, during these untold ages, gradually evolved them into worlds? Yes, there are evolutionists who so hold. We have included them in those who speak of ultimate being or of an uncaused cause as the source of all things. They are not absolutely atheistic, but they are so practically. They deny this God any superintending, directing or upholding relation to the universe. They deny Him any interference with the fixed laws of evolution though they may admit that He originated these laws. Charles Darwin was himself forced to admit that a vague being called God actually started things, but the theory so often associated with Darwin's name "deprives that God of all personality and attributes and banished Him," as another says, "to the remotest confines of time and space."

But our interlocutor is not yet satisfied, let us suppose. He still asks if we have been fair to the evolutionist. Are there not some, he will say, who go still further in recognizing God? Are there not some who deny that animals have come from plants? Are there not some who believe that animal life called for a new creative fiat, a new interposition of God? We answer yes, there are some evolutionists who believe that and who still call themselves evolutionists, *theistic* evolutionists, that is, evolutionists who believe in a personal Creator, God, and still remain evolutionists. But their name is a misnomer. Orthodox evolutionists themselves would disown them. Why? Because they contradict and bring into disrepute the very principle which the theory of evolution insists upon. That is, the principle of continuity, the principle that there are no gaps or breaks in the process of development. To quote another, "If I admit that God came into the process and used creative power to form something that had not existed hitherto, then there was a gap, a break in the continuity that a new creation filled. In other words, what thus came into being was in no sense the outgrowth or development of what went before, and thus the theory of evolution goes into the discard."

II

What Christianity Means

This much for evolution; now let us turn to Christianity. As we permitted the evolutionist to tell us what evolution means, so should we permit the Christian to tell us what Christianity means.

The inspired apostle Paul is the first and the chiefest expounder of Christianity. Let us hearken to what he says. With startling clearness, as Professor Machen expresses it, Paul summarizes what Christianity is in that precious passage where, writing to the Corinthians, he says:

> "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, and wherein ye stand;
>
> By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain.
>
> For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;
>
> And that he was buried, and that he

rose again the third day according to the scriptures:

And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve:

After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once" (1 Cor. 15:1-6).

Here observe that Paul, inspired writer though he was, is not resting on his own understanding of the subject, he is not asking his readers to accept his *ipse dixit* as to what Christianity is, but is giving them that which he himself "also received." He does not say whence he received it, but the inference is that he received it from our Lord Himself by special revelation. In an earlier chapter in this epistle, and in other places, Paul speaks of more than one such special revelation. Nor is it contradictory to this to say also, that Paul must have had elementary instruction in the Christian faith from the earliest disciples with whom he fellowshiped (Acts 9:19). And further still, as a pupil of Gamaliel, he must have tested that which he received from them by an examination of the Old Testament Scriptures on his own part. Paul was not ignorant of what Christianity was, and his definition of it may be relied upon.

Therefore, we see that according to Paul, there are at least three things which a Christian must believe in order to *be* a Christian, and any one, or all, of these three things is absolutely incompatible with evolution. What are these three things?

1. *A Christian must believe in the Scriptures.* I do not say he must believe the *Scriptures*, but he must at least believe *in* the Scriptures. The distinction between these two phrases will appear later. Personally, I *believe* the Scriptures. That is to say, I believe every record they contain is absolutely true or credible as a record. But that position is not necessary to the present argument. For the present argument it is only necessary to believe that the Scriptures are the source or foundation of the Christian faith. Paul believed and taught that. He said, "I delivered unto you how that Christ died for our sins *according to the scriptures.*" "He rose again the third day *according to the scriptures.*" The Scriptures were Paul's authority for what he said, the basis for the faith he delivered, that he taught to others. Hence, in Paul's mind, the Scriptures must have been divinely given, or, to express it in another way, the Bible must have been a revelation from God.

But if the Bible be a revelation from God, then it must have been an intervention in the otherwise continuous development of things. It must have been an intervention in the natural processes of thought, a gap, a break in that continuity so vital to the evolutionary hypothesis.

As already premised, one need not discuss the nature or extent of inspiration in order to establish this. One may hold any theory of inspiration that he pleases, so far as this argument is concerned. Nor is it a question of the interpretation of any particular passage or book of the Bible. One may be a Calvinist or an Arminian, a premillenarian or postmillenarian, it matters not. And further still, it is not even a question of a longer or a *Shorter Bible.* Professor Kent's Bible will answer in this case. It is simply the question of *a* Bible. *Have we a Bible?* If any revelation of the kind, longer or shorter, verbally or otherwise inspired, has come from God, then the man who believes that cannot be an evolutionist. Why? Because what thus came into being as a revelation from God was something that had not existed before. The Bible, in other words, was neither an outgrowth or a development of what preceded it. It broke into the continuity of things, and in doing that it thrust the theory of evolution into the discard.

2. *A Christian must believe in Christ.* And if the expression may be forgiven, He may not be any kind of a Christ that men may conceive or imagine in whom he must believe. No fictitious Christ, no ideal Christ, but the Christ of whom Paul speaks. "I delivered unto you * * * how that *Christ died for our sins* * * * And that *he was buried* and that *he rose again* the third day. * * * And that *he was seen* * * *" Here is a real historic being of whom certain marvelous facts are recorded.

Personally, I believe that Christ is God. "Very God of Very God," as the Nicene creed says, but that is not the question here. For the sake of the argument, we might momentarily waive the question of Christ's Godhead.

Personally, I believe that He died as a substitute for a guilty race, a vicarious sacrifice to divine justice, but that is not the question here. For the sake of the argument we might accept any lower view of the atonement. We might think of His dying only as an example or a martyr, if you please.

Personally, I believe that Christ arose from the dead in the body which was placed in the tomb, but that is not the question here. For the sake of the argument, one might almost be willing to

speak of a "spiritual resurrection," manifest contradiction though it be.

All these great and fundamental questions might be waived or set aside and for the moment we might speak of Christ only as a new and perfect type of the spiritual man. A man who spake as never man spake. A man who did as never man did. A man who loved as never man loved. A man who lived as never man lived. A man who was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. A man of innocence not only, but a holy man, positively holy. We might limit our understanding or our appreciation of Christ to these things, and then we might raise the question, Whence came He? "What *think* ye of Christ?" How shall we explain such a man? I say nothing about His virgin birth just now. I simply ask the question, How shall we account for Christ? And I place the responsibility for an answer where it belongs.

Recently, I read a sermon on this subject by a Dr. Williamson, of Pennsylvania, who quoted a Darwinian as saying that Jesus was simply the out flowering of a race that had been developing for millions of years. Then Dr. Williamson asked, "If that be true, why was there only one Christ and not a multitude of Christs at the outflowering of the race? And moreover, how did Christ happen to come at a time when, as historians record, the race had deteriorated both physically and morally? Finally, why are there not today, two thousand years after Christ, a great multitude of men who are an improvement upon that particular Christ?" Such an improvement is what evolution would lead us to expect. Why is it not so?

There can be but one reply, namely, that the Christ of Bethlehem and Nazareth, the Christ of Gethsemane and Calvary was Himself a miracle. And if a miracle, then a gap, a break in the continuity of things. Like the Word written, so the Word incarnate was not something that had before existed. He was not an outgrowth or development of what preceded Him. He broke into the continuity of things, and in doing that He thrust the theory of evolution into the discard.

3. A Christian must believe in redemption. He must believe in redemption needed and in redemption accomplished, for Paul says: "Christ died *for our sins* * * * He was buried * * * He rose again * * * And he was seen * * *" He does not say here what he says in his letter to the Romans, namely, that Christ "was raised again for our justification" (4:25), but it is implied of course. Christ's resurrection, in other words, was "the demonstration, the warrant, the proclamation of His acceptance" by the Father as the propitiation for our sins (Bishop Moule).

But now if "Christ died for our sins," then we are sinners, and helplessly and hopelessly so. There could have been no other escape from the consequences of our sin than the death of Christ or else so great a sacrifice would not have been required. For even if Christ's death were thought of only as that of an example or a martyr, it were still an awful sacrifice.

On the supposition therefore, that men were sinners in need of a supernatural Saviour and a supernatural salvation, is it not evident that they could not represent a rising race? Must they not be a fallen race? According to this, men are not coming up from a lower development in creation but almost the very opposite. Man in his natural state, in other words, does not represent an ascent but a descent. As others have expressed it, he is not an evolution but a devolution. Evolution says that man has come up from the brute, and that whatever there is imperfect in his nature was brought with him from the animal world, hence he is growing better all the while. If this be so, how can man be considered a sinner? And what responsibility has he for his misdeeds? And how does he require any redemption? Is he not to be congratulated on his progress rather than punished for his declension?

My friends, evolution may be true. Let us assume it for the moment. We are not discussing the objections to it from the scientific point of view. That will come at another time. All that we are insisting upon at present is that a Christian cannot be an evolutionist. An imaginary evolutionist, as another speaks of him, may call himself a Christian, but a real Christian cannot imagine himself an evolutionist. Why? Because a Christian must believe in the Scriptures, he must believe in Christ, he must believe in redemption. He must believe in some other things, but these three are what Paul is here setting before us as the definition of Christianity, and these are enough. These things are supernatural. They are gaps, they are breaks in the continuity of development. The first requirement of continuity is that nothing shall happen in nature that is opposed to the course of nature, and all these things have so happened, or else Christianity is a fake. All these things have so happened, or else our

preaching is void and your faith also is void. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God. Do you believe that? Are you prepared to assent to that? Until you are so prepared to do, you are not prepared to call yourself an evolutionist.

III

An Evolutionist and a Christian Contrasted

I have recently read *Life and Confessions of a Psychologist*, the autobiography of G. Stanley Hall, the first president, and indeed the creator and builder, if he was not the founder, of Clark University. President Hall was born and nurtured in a New England home. His parents were godly people. The environment of his academic and college days was Christian. He thought himself converted in his youth and united with the church. He even began to study for the ministry not as a vocation indeed, but as a profession. Then he went to Germany to further himself in philosophy and especially his chosen field of psychology and pedagogy. "I came home," said he, "feeling that I had attained maturity in my religious consciousness. I had felt the charm of pantheism, of agnosticism, even of materialism. But the only wholehearted scheme of things I had accepted *with ardor and abandon* was that of an evolution which applied no whit less to the soul than the body of man. This was bedrock." (p. 222.)

What kind of a building did G. Stanley Hall erect on this bedrock? "The hated Puritan Sunday • • • now became a day of joy and holiday recreation." "The teetotalism in which I had been nurtured went the way of the old Sabbatarianism and I came to love beer." "Hitherto girls had played an extremely small part in my life, but more than one German fräulein appeared to me in a new way and I cultivated several," and more to the same point.

How did G. Stanley Hall end his days? He died a year or two ago, and one of his devoted students and a near companion, Lorine Pruette, tells us in *The Century* what his outlook was on the beyond, and what was the evaluation of his earthly accomplishments when the silver cord was loosened and the golden bowl broken. "He enjoyed so the good things of life," said she, "from the perfect dinner to the perfect symphony! There was so much yet for him to do! His finest book he saw shaping itself in the future, and *death for him held all the horrors of annihilation, destruction of that keen brain, reduction to nothingness of all that stored wisdom he had won through the years.*"

That is the logic of evolution. I would put alongside of it the valedictory of the great apostle who told us the meaning of Christianity:

> "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing" (2 Tim. 4:7, 8).

Moody Monthly August, 1925

From book review in *Moody Monthly* of Eric Sauer's *The King of the Earth:*

In the part of this work dealing with the origin of the earth, the relationship of science and Scripture is well stated: "We must not *a priori* equate Scripture with our exposition of it. The so-called contradictions between faith in the Bible and science are in fact not a conflict between the Bible and assured scientific knowledge, but between interpretations of the Bible and scientific theories. They are often a collision between popular traditions and philosophical speculation, which have been simply accepted from others without being tested."

It is to be regretted that in this splendid work Sauer has erroneously stated that "the attempt to interpret the geological facts as results of the flood is impossible." Resting largely on the thinking of Ramm, this conclusion has caused him to fail to reckon with the cogent arguments offered by those scholars who advocate a flood geology theory.—*Charles M. Horne*

GOD AND THE COSMOS. Theodore Graebner. A Critical Examination of Atheism, Materialism and Evolutionism. 453 pages. $3.50

WHY I ACCEPT THE GENESIS RECORD By John Raymond Hand — 20¢

What About Evolution?

George McCready Price

WHY DO so many people have the idea that they can ignore thinking about the great problems of life, including the questions of where we came from and where we are going? Many people who appear to be intelligent think that they can completely ignore such a problem as that of evolution. They are not interested in such subjects and don't want to bother their heads about them. Let the highbrows spend their time with speculations about man's monkey ancestry if they want to; but there are much more important problems all around us in everyday life, they say.

Oh, yes, we can be so busy watching television, or making an honest living, or just visiting and chattering from morning to night, that we never take the time to look into such matters.

And then before very long we may have so allowed our minds to rust and atrophy from lack of use that we are in danger of losing all capacity for thinking about the more fundamental facts and problems of life. For it is a law of nature that we soon lose those powers of the mind and the brain which we do not exercise.

What about evolution? It is a sad mistake to think that we can evade this subject. Essentially all educated people today have been taught to accept evolution as a well-established scientific fact; and the acceptance of this view has probably done more to change the intellectual climate and the religious thinking of the world than any other influence. No intelligent man or woman can afford to ignore something of such tremendous importance.

The evolutionary theory is based on naturalism, on the idea that the present phenomena that we call "natural law" have always prevailed in the past, that even the origin of everything in the world can be explained by natural processes, or processes now going on. This is Darwinian evolution in a nutshell.

And we are going to hear a great deal more about this subject. For during the remainder of 1959 and probably during all of 1960, the dedicated missionaries of the development theory are going to be very busy. Since almost all the modern media of communication—books, periodicals, radio, etc.—are under their control, the public is bound to be drilled into thinking that everybody has now accepted this which is so proudly called the scientific view of the world. Modern technical science has been doing such wonders (our grandparents would have called them miracles) that people have adopted an attitude of mind in which they are ready to accept or believe almost anything called scientific.

But it necessarily follows from the present situation that very few are aware of the many solid scientific facts which can now be brought forward to oppose the theory of man's supposed development from animal ancestors. I

am not planning to give here the details of the arguments now available against this theory. I am only saying that such solid scientific facts are available for those who wish to know about them.

After all, the theory of evolution is not so much a question of science as it is an attitude of mind, a philosophy. People usually believe what they want to believe. One of our wisest modern writers has said that all who look for hooks to hang their doubts upon will find them. During the past century and a half, vast new areas of nature have been opened up for study. A Biblical prophecy of twenty-five centuries ago declared that many would be running to and fro and knowledge would be increased in "the time of the end," or in the last days of human history. But this increase of knowledge, which should have brought an increase of admiration and reverence for the Creator of the universe, has been twisted and perverted into seemingly learned reasons for forgetting Him. And evolution is only one of the hooks upon which modern man can hang his doubts and denial of his Creator.

In essence the theory of development, or evolution, is an attempt to explain the origin of the world and everything in it by present-day natural law, or in terms of what we see going on around us. It is naturalism and a denial of the supranatural, of anything beyond or outside that we commonly call scientific. It not only applies this idea of naturalism to everything in our modern world, but it extends it backward to the beginning. Thus it is opposed to, or denies, *two* events recorded in the early chapters of the Bible: that fiat creation at the beginning and the universal Deluge.

By denying that there ever was any such divine cosmic disaster as the Flood, it professes to explain the fossils and the geological changes in terms of present-acting processes of the ocean and the rivers, erosion and deposition, volcanic and chemical action. And by artificially arranging the fossils and the rocks in terms of what it calls a true historical order, it extends the history of the earth backward into the dim shadows of millions of years in the past, thus forming an outline, or skeleton, on which to build its theory of organic development.

But its chief aim is to deny or explain away the fiat creation, or supernatural origin of the world, as recorded in the first chapters of Genesis. The Biblical record puts the emphasis not on the mere act of creating, but on the *manner* in which it was done. The Creator might have made the world in one day, or even instantaneously, but He did not. He might have taken ten or twenty-five days, but He did not. Deliberately He did make the beginnings in stages; for He took six days to finish the work, and then ceased or rested, as a lawyer does when his case is completed. And then He set apart the next similar period, or day—the seventh—as an everlasting memorial of *the way* in which He had done the creating, and as a reminder that His method of creating was something entirely different from His subsequent activity in upholding or managing the things which He has created.

Our present-day situation is vividly described in the Second Epistle of Peter. Goodspeed's Translation states: "First of all, you must understand this, that in the last days mockers will come with their mockeries, going where their passions lead and saying, 'Where is his promised coming? For ever since our forefathers fell asleep everything has remained as it was from the beginning of creation!' For they wilfully ignore the fact that long ago there existed heavens and an earth which had been formed at God's command out of water

and by water, by which also that world was destroyed, through being flooded with water. But by the same command the present heavens and earth are stored up for fire, and are kept for the day when godless men are to be judged and destroyed." 2 Peter 3:3-7.

Nobody can deny that this is a vivid and accurate picture of the scientific attitude of our day. These mockers of the last days may be described as *uniformitarians;* they appeal to natural law, and they say that this present-day natural law has always prevailed in the past. Our forefathers may have thought differently, but modern men *know* better. They have become scientific. (How could the Biblical picture have been made more vivid and accurate?)

And how does the apostle answer them? He quotes the divine record of the Flood. He says that they "wilfully ignore" the record of the Flood. The world that God first created was destroyed by water; it is going to be destroyed next time by fire. That is his inspired answer to the last-day mockers.

And it is our answer today. If we believe Moses' record of a universal Flood, we have an answer to the noisy claims of geology. And then, by thus disposing of the uniformitarian geology as taught by Charles Lyell, we will not have any trouble with the uniformitarian biology of Charles Darwin.

Is it not important for us to become intelligent about evolution?

THESE TIMES, JUNE, 1959

WHAT ARE THE OLDEST AND YOUNGEST FOSSILS?

by D. J. Whitney

The right answer here is that among typical fossils there is no evidence that one is materially older than the others, but that the youngest fossils are those which are found in bogs, and the material of the bogs must have accumulated since present lands were uplifted. Therefore the fossils of bogs came into being recently. So, apparently, did the fossil animals of the far north whose frozen flesh is found in a mixture of ice and mud.

For the typical more or less stratified rocks like shales, sandstones, limestones and conglomerate in that order of abundance, all seem to have formed in one great recent remaking of the crust of the antedeluvian earth, with some disturbance to ocean floor, and the uplift of present lands.

Two areas of the earth's surface that resemble one another greatly can be compared here: the Alps of Central Europe and the Rocky Mountains of Northern Montana and southern Alberta. The material of each was former shallow sea floor, and the breaking up of each area was at the same time, only a few thousand years ago. However, much of the limestone of the Rockies is classified in the ages theory as being a billion or more years old, although certain places, where there are fossils, are classified as only a tiny fraction of such age; and all were uplifted not a very long time ago. Also in the French Alps as shown in Grabau's *Textbook of Historical Geology* material at the top is classified as being composed of Mesozoic sediments now figured as being say 60 to 120 million years old, while the lands around Lake Geneva whose bed extends

well below sea level, is classified as about as young as sedimentary rocks can be.

Now consider the Sierra Nevada Range of eastern California, one peak of which rises higher than any mountain in the Rocky Mountains of the U.S. or southern Canada;reaching a height of 14,495 feet.Much of this Sierra at lower levels was worked over for gold a century and less ago and numerous human bones and bones of extinct animals were found. All of this area must have been close to sea level a few thousand years ago and made over in a deluge ruin and present mountains were then uplifted.

The kind of history that the earthseems to have had was: first a recent making of the solar system as a whole, and either immediately or a little after that the making of an unordered earth, warm at the surface and covered with dense clouds,into an ideal world with a far more varied population of plants and animals than it has now, and an Adam and Eve, 'created in the image and likeness of God.'

They made a foolish mistake as the third chapter of Genesis states and later the antedeluvian earth was made over by the deluge and present lands were then uplifted. But Noah's immediate descendents ade a failure of things too. Early human history was as Genesis and later historical books of the Bible indicate; and again it looks as if human society was close to its second end.

The main problem in historical geology is whether the earth is immensely old and went through a series of geologic ages,or started as an ideal earth that went bad and was made over at the time of the Deluge. The evidence is more than 999 to 1 that the latter was the case.

It's a fine magazine.

W. E. Morris
Young Christian's Lending Library
Murray, Kentucky

Enjoyed your two numbers of THE CREATIONIST very much. I wish all young people would subscribe and and fortify themselves against the enemy.

W. Terry Varner
Shadyside, Ohio

DID YOU MISS THESE?

Genesis and Geology

Case for Creation 4004 B.C.

Does Nature Favor Evolution?

What Genesis Teaches About Creation

What Is the Real Problem of Creation?

You missed them all if you missed THE CREATIONIST No. 2. Order you copy now. 30¢

NEW DISCOVERIES IN BABYLONIA ABOUT GENESIS by ***J. P. Wiseman.*** Produces new and convincing archeological and literary evidence.
No. 11031 ~~$2.50~~

THE CREATIONIST
Published by
CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE LEAGUE
Box 173, Malverne, N.Y 11565

READ: "EVOLUTION A RELIGIOUS DOGMA" 50¢
CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE LEAGUE
MALVERNE, N. Y. 11565

FEET OF CLAY: The Unscientific Nonsense of Historical Geology
by George McCready Price
The Case Against the geological ages. 25c

WERE THE FOSSILS CONTEMPORARY?
by George McCready Price
The critical Time-element in the discussion of evolution, geology and the Bible. 25c

AFTER ITS KIND by Byron C. Nelson
A convincing dissertation of the fallacy of the theory of organic evolution. ~~$2.50~~
Code 10-100

THE DELUGE STORY IN STONE by Byron C. Nelson
Evidence from the sciences to substantiate the Bible story of the Deluge. ~~$2.50~~
Code 10-925

Nothing Like It in Print!

Why We Believe In CREATION Not Evolution

By Fred John Meldau, Editor for 35 years of Christian Victory Magazine.

This Book is a FACT - BOMB Capable of "Vaporizing" the Evolutionary Theory in Any Open Minded Reader!

Undeniable, documented FACTS.

340 pages, averaging 5 facts per page, all supported by quotations of recognized authorities. Covers the vast scope of human knowledge from sub-atoms to super galaxies. Absolutely devastating in refuting the evolutionary hypothesis.

Handsomely bound. ~~$3.95~~.

Order today

Paperback $2.75

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE LEAGUE
P. O. Box 173
Malverne, New York 11565
Please add 3% for postage.
All prices subject to change without notice.

THE FACE OF THE DEEP: A Defense of Divine Creation

Dudley Joseph Whitney

Boldly challenging some strongly held theories of contemporary science, the author trenchantly argues against all the sacred cows of geology. Particularly, he holds that the earth was not created 2,000,000,000 years ago but only about 4000 B.C., and that the present state of the earth can be explained *in all respects* by the Noachian Deluge described in the Bible. With brilliant analyses and a wealth of learning, he advances closely reasoned hypotheses concerning the formation of sedimentary and metamorphic rocks, the manner in which the continents and oceans arose, the origin of the solar system and the nature of heat production. Here is a book that merits the careful consideration of everyone interested in a rapprochement between science and religion. ~~$2.50~~

CEL PUBLICATIONS

Finn, A. H.	
The Author of the Pentateuch	~~1.25~~
Price, George McCready:	
Problems and Methods in Geology	1.00
Were the Fossils Contemporary	.25
Feet of Clay: The Unscientific Nonsense of Historical Geology	.25
Fox, H. E.	
Our Lord and His Bible	.35
Hopkins, Mark:	
Exclusive Traits of Christianity	.25
Hastings, H. L.:	
The Bible and Its Critics	.25
Friendly Hints to Candid Inquirers Who Disbelieve the Bible	.25
Bates, William H.:	
A Study in the Genealogy of Jesus	.15
Whitney, D. J.:	
Face of the Deep	~~2.50~~
How Did the Earth Originate	.15
How Old Is the Earth	.15
The Noachian Deluge	.25
The Animals and the Ark	.15
Cause of the Deluge and Related Problems	.15
Fawthrop, F. W.:	
Did Moses Write the Pentateuch	.10
The Creationist. No. 1	.30